arXiv:1206.2623v3 [hep-ph] 16 Nov 2012

On Composite Two Higgs Doublet Models

Enrico Bertuzzo, Tirtha Sankar Ray, Hiroshi de Sandes and Carlos A. Savoy

Institut de Physique Théorique, CEA-Saclay,
F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France.

Abstract

We investigate composite two Higgs doublet models realized as pseudo Goldstone modes, generated through the spontaneous breaking of a global symmetry due to strong dynamic at the TeV scale. A detailed comparative survey of two possible symmetry breaking patterns, $SU(5) \to SU(4) \times U(1)$ and $SU(5) \to SU(4)$, is made. We point out choices for the Standard Model fermion representations that can alleviate some phenomenological constraints, with emphasis towards a simultaneous solution of anomalous $Zb\bar{b}$ coupling and Higgs mediated Flavor Changing Neutral Currents. We also write down the kinetic lagrangian for several models leading to Two Higgs Doublets and identify the anomalous contributions to the T parameter. Moreover, we describe a model based on the breaking $SO(9)/SO(8)$ in which there is no tree-level breaking of custodial symmetry, discussing also the possible embeddings for the fermion fields.

1 Introduction

The Atlas [1] and CMS [2] collaborations have recently announced the discovery of a new resonance, with mass of about 125 GeV and with properties compatible with those of a Higgs particle. This opens up a new era for particle physics, since the exploration of the Electroweak Symmetry Breaking (EWSB) sector is just at its beginning. A major priority is now the determination of the Higgs properties, *i.e.* production cross sections and branching ratios. This might shed light on the mechanism of EWSB and remove the veil off any new physics that may control the tera-scale.

If the Higgs has a non trivial substructure, deviations from the Standard Model (SM) couplings may be observed, while underlying symmetries can protect its mass from dangerous quantum corrections. This simple solution to the gauge hierarchy problem is naturally realized if the Higgs fields are pseudo-Goldstone bosons (PNGB) arising from a spontaneous breaking $G \to H$ due to some strong dynamics at some scale f [3–6]. Once the strong sector is integrated out, the residual effective theory can be described in terms of a non-linear sigma model with the Higgs belonging to the coset space G/H. Interestingly, some of these models can be considered as 4-dimensional duals of 5-dimensional gauge-Higgs unified theories realized in AdS_5 space. Holographic techniques [7] give then a handle on how to deduce the structure functions of the effective low energy theories. However, the most important phenomenology can be extracted from effective theories with fairly general considerations about the strong sector and in terms of an expansion in the parameter $\epsilon \equiv v/f$, with v the Fermi scale.

Models with minimal [8–10] and non-minimal [11–13] scalar sectors have been studied in the literature. Let us notice that several complications are introduced once non-minimal models are considered. The most important issue is to protect the ratio between the vector boson masses. LEP precision measurements at the Z pole strongly constraint this ratio, quantified in term of the oblique electroweak parameter T. Two Higgs doublet models are notorious for breaking the custodial symmetry that protect the T parameter. The situation is even worse in composite models, which are inherently non-renormalizable implying a less constrained Lagrangian.

We observe that from the group theoretical point of view, the theory can be simply described in terms of some special coordinates of the coset space. We take care to differentiate between the Goldstone fields that leave the theory invariant under shift symmetry and these coordinates. The latter provide non-linear realizations (n.l.r.) of the Higgs fields that can originate the symmetry breaking as defined by the coset. We discuss the metric of the coset that gives the PNGB Lagrangian in terms of these coordinates and point out the correlation between the metric, custodial symmetry and tree-level contributions to T for the different cosets defining Two Higgs Doublet Models (2HDM).

In this paper we focus on the symmetry breaking patterns $SU(5) \to SU(4) \times H'$ with $H' = U(1)$ or nothing. In the former case, 8 pseudo Goldstone modes are delivered, fitting into two SM doublets. In the latter scenario, the breaking leads to 9 broken generators that fill up two SM doublets and one SM singlet. We find that the Higgs couplings to W bosons and fermions are modified with respect to those of the SM Higgs boson, so that different production and decay rates are expected. This is analogous to what happens in the Minimal Composite Higgs Model (MCHM) based on $SO(5)/SO(4)$ [8]. One might expect the unbroken global symmetry $SU(4)$ to be large enough to guarantee alignment between the vacuum expectation values (vev) of the two Higgs, so that custodial symmetry is preserved. However, in both cases this is not true already at tree level, since the Z boson mass receives contributions which are not present in the W mass. The additional SM singlet in $SU(5)/SU(4)$ would also lead to interesting phenomenology.

The lowest dimensional representations of $SU(5)$, **5** and **10**, provide a natural embedding for the SM fermions. We perform a systematic study of all the possibilities, clearly differentiating between cases that can be successfully embedded into a 5d completion and those in which this is not possible. We find that the embedding of the SM fermions in the **10** can lead to a simultaneous resolution of the usual problems of anomalous $Z\bar{b}_L b_L$ [14] and the flavor problems [15]. The contribution to the (Coleman-Weinberg) PNGB potential from these fermions is displayed and, in general, does not have the symmetry to align the Higgs vev's. We assume that some tuning of the compositeness parameters could help. We note that the dependence of the one loop potential on the PNGBs is such that a massless state is always present. Introducing (at least) two right handed neutrinos can solve this problem for fermions embedded in the **5** of $SU(5)$.

It was pointed out that [12] (see also Appendix D below) in the $Sp(6)/Sp(4) \times Sp(2)$ case with a specific embedding of the gauge generators, there are no contributions to the T parameter. Here, we describe the other $T-$safe models based on the coset $SO(9)/SO(8)$ which exhibit the needed custodial symmetry. Unfortunately, it has a serious FCNC problem since the embeddings of the fermions is never unique.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sections 2-3 we state the problem and set the notation studying the coset and discussing the gauge interactions for $SU(5)/SU(4) \times U(1)$ and $SU(5)/SU(4)$.

In Section 4 we compare the tree level contribution to the T parameter for different cosets leading to 8 or 9 Goldstone modes. In Section 5 we discuss in detail the possible embeddings for the SM fermions in $SU(5)$ representations and their phenomenological consequences. In Section 6 we study the scalar potential in the $SU(5)$ case, while in Section 7 we analyze the symmetry breaking pattern $SO(9)/SO(8)$. Finally we conclude with some general observations.

2 Non linear realization of the Higgs fields

To state the problem and set the notation, we study here the breaking patterns $SU(5)/SU(4)$ and $SU(5)/SU(4)\times U(1)$.

The coset space of the two cases is quite similar, although they contain a different number of Goldstone modes. The Goldstone modes can be parametrized as the matrix

$$\Pi = \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} \multicolumn{2}{c|}{\frac{1}{\sqrt{20}}\phi_0 \mathbf{1}_4} & \begin{matrix}\Phi \\ \tilde{\Phi}\end{matrix} \\ \hline \Phi^\dagger & \tilde{\Phi}^\dagger & -\frac{4}{\sqrt{20}}\phi_0 \end{array}\right), \tag{2.1}$$

where Φ and $\tilde{\Phi}$ are written in terms of two complex $SU(2)_L$ doublets $\phi_1\,,\phi_2$ as

$$\Phi \equiv \frac{\phi_1 + i\phi_2}{\sqrt{2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\Phi} \equiv \frac{\tilde{\phi}_1 + i\tilde{\phi}_2}{\sqrt{2}}, \tag{2.2}$$

with $\tilde{\phi}_i = i\sigma_2 \phi_i^*$ (see Appendix A for the conventions on the generators of the group). Each $(\phi_i\,,\tilde{\phi}_i)$ transforms as a $(\mathbf{2}\,,\mathbf{2})$ of $SU(2)_L\times SU(2)_R$, while the 9^{th} Goldstone boson, the singlet ϕ_0, is present only in the $SU(5)/SU(4)$ coset. Correspondingly, the Goldstone boson matrix for the symmetric coset $SU(5)/SU(4)\times U(1)$ is obtained for $\phi_0 = 0$.

To write the non linear realization of the Higgs fields, it is convenient to choose a specific direction for the vacuum Σ_0. The breaking $SU(5)\to SU(4)$ can be parametrized either through the fundamental or the symmetric representation of $SU(5)$,

$$\mathbf{5}:\quad \Sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0\\0\\0\\0\\1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathbf{15}:\quad \Sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0&0&0&0&0\\0&0&0&0&0\\0&0&0&0&0\\0&0&0&0&0\\0&0&0&0&1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad [SU(5)/SU(4)],$$

while $SU(5)\to SU(4)\times U(1)$ can be parametrized through the adjoint representation,

$$\mathbf{24}:\quad \Sigma_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{20}} \begin{pmatrix} 1&0&0&0&0\\0&1&0&0&0\\0&0&1&0&0\\0&0&0&1&0\\0&0&0&0&-4 \end{pmatrix} \qquad [SU(5)/SU(4)\times U(1)].$$

The excitations around the vacuum in the different cases are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{5}: &\quad \Sigma = e^{\frac{i\Pi}{f}}\Sigma_0\\ \mathbf{15}: &\quad \Sigma = e^{\frac{i\Pi}{f}}\Sigma_0 e^{\frac{i\Pi^T}{f}}\\ \mathbf{24}: &\quad \Sigma = e^{\frac{i\Pi}{f}}\Sigma_0 e^{\frac{-i\Pi}{f}}\end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where the appropriate vacuum Σ_0 must be used and f is the scale at which the breaking occurs.

A useful simplification in the expressions can be achieved introducing a 5-components unit vector u as follows. In the $SU(5)/SU(4)$ case, u reads

$$u = e^{-i\frac{3}{5}\frac{\phi_0}{f}} \begin{pmatrix} i\frac{\sin\left(\frac{\varphi}{f}\right)}{\varphi}\begin{pmatrix}\Phi\\ \tilde{\Phi}\end{pmatrix} \\ \cos\left(\frac{\varphi}{f}\right) + i\phi_0\frac{\sin\left(\frac{\varphi}{f}\right)}{\varphi}\end{pmatrix}, \qquad u^\dagger u = 1\ , \tag{2.4}$$

where $\varphi = \sqrt{|\Phi|^2 + |\tilde{\Phi}|^2 + \phi_0^2}$ and

$$\Sigma = u \ \ [\mathbf{5}], \quad \Sigma = uu^T \ \ [\mathbf{15}] \tag{2.5}$$

In the $SU(5)/SU(4)\times U(1)$ case, with $\phi_0 = 0$,

$$u = \begin{pmatrix} i\frac{\sin\left(\frac{\varphi}{f}\right)}{\varphi}\begin{pmatrix}\Phi\\ \tilde{\Phi}\end{pmatrix} \\ \cos\left(\frac{\varphi}{f}\right)\end{pmatrix}, \qquad u^\dagger u = 1\ , \tag{2.6}$$

where now $\varphi = \sqrt{|\Phi|^2 + |\tilde{\Phi}|^2}$. In this case the Σ matrix reads

$$\Sigma = -\frac{\sqrt{5}}{2}\left(uu^\dagger - \frac{\mathbf{1}_5}{5}\right)\ . \tag{2.7}$$

Notice that $uu^\dagger$ is the projector along the u direction: this fact turns out to be instrumental to avoid Flavor Changing Neutral Currents (FCNC), as we will see in Section 5. Because φ is invariant under the preserved $SU(4)$, u linearly transforms as a $\mathbf{4}+\mathbf{1}$, analogously to the Goldstone fields in (2.1).

Using the explicit expressions for the non linear realizations of the Higgs fields, Eqs. (2.4)-(2.7), one can write down the kinetic and gauge Lagrangian. Their expressions are particularly simple using the u variables, which allow to write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{PNGB} = &\ f^2\left(\partial^\mu u^\dagger\partial_\mu u - u^\dagger\partial_\mu u\,\partial^\mu u^\dagger u\right) \quad [SU(5)/SU(4)\times U(1)]\\ = &\ f^2\left(\partial^\mu u^\dagger\partial_\mu u - \tfrac{3}{8}u^\dagger\partial_\mu u\,\partial^\mu u^\dagger u\right) \quad [SU(5)/SU(4)]\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

Notice that the $SU(5)/SU(4)$ result can be obtained parameterizing the breaking either with a **5** or with a **15**.

We have explicitly checked that the previous expressions are equivalent to the usual CCWZ construction [16].

The structure of these expressions justifies the use of the complex vector u in most of the analysis below as the coset coordinates. The $SU(4) \supset SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ symmetry is manifest.

3 Gauge interactions

The gauge Lagrangian for the Goldstone bosons in the effective theory can be written from (2.8) introducing covariant derivatives for the u variables, $\partial u_i \to \partial u_i - i(\hat{W}u)_i$, with $\hat{W}_\mu = gW^+_\mu T^-_L + gW^+_\mu T^-_L + eA_\mu(T^3_L + T^3_R) + g\sec\theta_W Z_\mu(T^3_L - \tan^2\theta_W T^3_R)$. Therefore the coupling of the SM gauge bosons to the PNGB fields contains two algebraically different terms,

$$u^\dagger \hat{W}_\mu \hat{W}_\mu u - \kappa\, u^\dagger \hat{W}_\mu u\, u^\dagger \hat{W}_\nu u \ , \tag{3.1}$$

and only the first one, quadratic in u, is analogous to the SM.

In momentum space, the gauge Lagrangian then reads

$$\mathcal{L}_{gauge} = \frac{1}{2} p^T_{\mu\nu} \left[\Pi_0(q^2) \mathrm{tr}(\hat{W}_\mu \hat{W}_\nu) + \Pi_1(q^2)(u^\dagger \hat{W}_\mu \hat{W}_\nu u - \kappa\, u^\dagger \hat{W}_\mu u\, u^\dagger \hat{W}_\nu u) \right] \tag{3.2}$$

where $\kappa = 1$ or $3/8$ as in (2.8) and $\Pi_0(q^2)$ and $\Pi_1(q^2)$ are form factors.

Because only a subgroup of the unbroken $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \simeq SO(4) \subset SU(4)$ is gauged, Eq. (3.2) is not $SO(4)$ invariant. In the usual two Higgs doublet models, only the vacuum alignment between the two doublets ensures a custodial $O(3)$ to protect the T parameter. In our case we immediately see that in both the cases under consideration this is not true, since the additional term (quartic in u) spoils the custodial symmetry already at tree level.

To investigate this crucial point, let us keep in (3.2) only the components of u with electric charge $T^3_L + T^3_R = 0$, namely, u_2 and u_3 with the conventions in Appendix A. In the specific representation for the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ generators in the Appendix, the masses of the gauge bosons are

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = f^2 \left(\langle |u_2|^2\rangle + \langle |u_3|^2\rangle\right) \frac{g^2}{2} \left(W^+_\mu W^-_\mu + \frac{1}{2\cos^2\theta_W} \left(1 - \kappa \frac{(\langle |u_2|^2\rangle - \langle |u_3|^2\rangle)^2}{\langle |u_2|^2\rangle + \langle |u_3|^2\rangle} \right) Z_\mu Z_\mu \right) . \tag{3.3}$$

In both cases, it is the quartic contribution to the Z mass that breaks the custodial symmetry, unless $\langle |u_2|\rangle = \langle |u_3|\rangle$. This is precisely the condition for the alignment of the two doublets in the vacuum and the conservation of the custodial $O(3)$ symmetry. Since the PNGB potential is generated at loop level, in general it cannot guarantee such a degeneracy for the solution, so that a large contribution to the T parameter should be present already at tree level.

However, let us stress that: *i*) in principle, the custodial symmetry could be effective in a region of the parameter space from the equations of motion, *ii*) the contributions to the T parameter (both at tree and loop level) from the scalar sector can be partially compensated by fermionic contributions [17]. Moreover, it is interesting to note that different couplings between the Higgs boson and the W and Z vectors could be important to explain the cross-section and branching ratios of the observed excess around 125 GeV [18].

4 Other composite 2HDM's: non-linear realizations, PNGB lagrangian and T parameter

As pointed out in the previous section, the presence of a term quartic in u in the metric generates a contribution to the T parameter already at tree level. This despite the presence of a large residual global symmetry $H \subset G$ containing the custodial symmetry as a subgroup.

In this section we display the PNGB lagrangian for the different cosets leading to 2HDM's. We consider cosets $G/H_1 \otimes H_2$ with $H_2 = \emptyset$, $U(1)$, $SU(2)$. A detailed discussion of the construction will appear elsewhere, here we just collect the results below. As already noticed above for $G = SU(5)$, it is useful to introduce as coset coordinates p orthogonal unit vectors u^α ($\alpha = 1, \ldots, p$) in the fundamental representation $\mathbf{N}$ of G whose scalar products satisfy:

$$u^\dagger_\alpha u^\beta = \delta^\beta_\alpha \qquad \mathrm{tr}\, u^\dagger u \equiv \sum_\alpha u^\dagger_\alpha u^\alpha = p \tag{4.1}$$

where $p = 1$ for $H_2 = \emptyset$, $U(1)$ and $p = 2$ for $H_2 = O(2)$, $SU(2)$. They are functions of the PNGB fields, ξ^A defined by

$$u(\xi) = e^{i\Pi(\xi)} u(0) \qquad \Pi(\xi) = \sum_A \xi_A T^A \tag{4.2}$$

where ξ_A are the PNGB fields and T^A are the coset charges, while $u(0)$ corresponds to the vev('s) of one or more n.l.r. of the Higgs in fundamental representation(s) needed for the breaking. The H_2 symmetry is implemented by the transformation $U \in H_2 : u \to U u U^\dagger$. In particular, n.l.r. in terms of larger irreducible transformations are obtained - as already displayed above for $G = SU(5)$ - with $\Sigma = u u^\dagger$ for the adjoint representation, $\Sigma = u u^T$ for the symmetric, etc..

Let us just display the PNGB lagrangians for cosets associated to C2HDM's along these lines. For simplicity, the lagrangians are arbitrarily normalized. For $G = SU(5)$ the results are already given in (2.8).

Now, consider $SO(6)/SO(4) \times SO(2) \equiv SU(4)/SU(2) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ and let us first consider the construction in terms of two $\mathbf{4}$ representations of $SU(4)$ satisfying the previous rules, namely, u^α_i ($\alpha = 1, 2\,; i = 1, \ldots, 4$), $H_2 = SU(2)$. Then,

$$\mathcal{L}_{PNGB} = f^2 \mathrm{tr}\, \left(\partial^\mu u^\dagger \partial_\mu u - u^\dagger \partial_\mu u\, \partial^\mu u^\dagger u\right) \qquad (SU(4)/SU(2)^2 \times U(1)) \tag{4.3}$$

But, this can be also written in terms of two (real) vectors of $SO(6)$, denoted v^α_a ($\alpha = 1, 2\,; a = 1, \ldots, 6$), $H_2 = SO(2)$ to obtain,

$$\mathcal{L}_{PNGB} = f^2 \mathrm{tr}\, \left(\partial^\mu v^T \partial_\mu v - v^T \partial_\mu v\, \partial^\mu v^T v\right) \qquad (SO(6)/SO(4) \times SO(2)) \tag{4.4}$$

which, up to a normalization, is the same as (4.3) if one replaces $v^\alpha_a = \bar{u}^\alpha \Gamma_a u^\alpha$, where Γ_a are $SO(6)$ Dirac matrices.

The $SO(9)/SO(8)$ manifold is the 8-sphere, resulting in the corresponding metric for the lagrangian for the real 9-vector u,

$$\mathcal{L}_{PNGB} = f^2 \mathrm{tr}\, \left(\partial^\mu u^T \partial_\mu u\right) \qquad (SO(9)/SO(8)) \tag{4.5}$$

For the last case, $Sp(6)/Sp(4) \times Sp(2)$, as discussed in the Appendix, the lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = f^2 \left(\partial^\mu u^\dagger \partial_\mu u - \partial^\mu u^\dagger u u^\dagger \partial_\mu u - \partial^\mu u^\dagger \Omega_6 u^\dagger \partial_\mu u \Omega_6 u\right) \;, \tag{4.6}$$

Substituting the standard derivatives with appropriate covariant derivatives, $\partial u_i \to \partial u_i - i(\hat{W} u)_i$, with $\hat{W}_\mu = g W^+_\mu T^-_L + g W^+_\mu T^-_L + e A_\mu (T^3_L + T^3_R) + g \sec\theta_W Z_\mu (T^3_L - \tan^2\theta_W T^3_R)$, the gauge boson masses and possible contributions to the T parameter can be read from the previous expressions.

	5	**10**
g_{q_L}	$\lvert u_3\rvert^2+\lvert u_4\rvert^2, \lvert u_1\rvert^2+\lvert u_2\rvert^2$	$\begin{pmatrix} \lvert u_5\rvert^2+\lvert u_3\rvert^2 & u_4^* u_3 \\ u_4 u_3^* & \lvert u_5\rvert^2+\lvert u_4\rvert^2 \end{pmatrix}$
g_{t_R}	$\lvert u_5\rvert^2$	$\lvert u_1\rvert^2+\lvert u_2\rvert^2+\lvert u_3\rvert^2+\lvert u_4\rvert^2$
g_{b_R}	$\lvert u_5\rvert^2$	$\lvert u_3\rvert^2+\lvert u_4\rvert^2$
g_{tq}	$u_5 \begin{pmatrix} u_3 \\ u_{4,} \end{pmatrix}^\dagger$	$u_5^* \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_2 \end{pmatrix}^T (i\sigma_2)$
g_{bq}	$u_5 \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \\ u_{2,} \end{pmatrix}^\dagger$	$u_5^* \begin{pmatrix} u_3 \\ u_4 \end{pmatrix}^T (i\sigma_2)$

Table 1: Couplings between the SM fermions and the u variables, as defined in Eq. (5.1), according to the $SU(5)$ representation in which they are embedded. The result can be applied both to $SU(5)/SU(4)$ and $SU(5)/SU(4)\times U(1)$ choosing the appropriate expression for u. In the case of the **5**, the first value for g_{q_L} refers to q_L^t, the second to q_L^b.

With the exception of the $SO(9)/SO(8)$ scenario (to be discussed more in detail in Section 7), all the other examples have higher dimensional terms in the gauge interactions that can potentially break custodial symmetry. Indeed, if one denotes the electroweak charges by T_M, the quadratic term in the SM gauge couplings to the PNGB fields contains the expression $\operatorname{tr} u^\dagger T_M T_N u$, which gets separate contributions from each Higgs doublet, leading to the usual coupling of renormalizable 2HDM's. Instead, the quartic term contains $\operatorname{tr} u^\dagger T_M u\, u^\dagger T_N u$ which has a mixed contribution to the Z couplings only (as a non-renormalizable 2HDM), giving a tree level contribution to the T parameter. Let us stress however that, as discussed more in detail in Appendix D, in the $Sp(6)/Sp(4)\times Sp(2)$ case, for a specific embedding of the gauge generators, there are no contributions to the T parameter [12].

5 Fermion Embeddings

As usual in Composite Higgs models, the coset structure does not fix the embedding of the fermions in G representations. Moreover, different choices will in principle generate different terms in the Coleman-Weinberg potential. However, some general considerations allow to make the model theoretically consistent and phenomenologically viable. Some of the important issues are:

1. LEP has measured the $Zb_L\bar{b}_L$ coupling with high precision, finding results in agreement with the SM prediction at nearly 0.25% level. As shown in [14], a custodial symmetry can protect this coupling from large contributions due to composite states. The argument boils down to the conclusion that the left handed quark doublet (at least the third generation) should be embedded in a $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2})_{\mathbf{2/3}}$ representation of $SU(2)_L\times SU(2)_R\times U(1)_X$ in order to protect this coupling from getting too large corrections.

2. If the SM fermions can be embedded into G representations in a unique way, then the problem of FCNC is considerable reduced [11,12,15].

3. To have successful gauge-Higgs unification in the 5d perturbative dual of the strongly coupled 4d model, all the fermions should be in the same representation of the gauge group (global group, from the 4d point of view). Also, the PNGB are the 5-th component of gauge bosons. However, this is not a stringent consideration for the purely 4d model, and we will actually explore some of the advantages of using LH and RH fermions in different representations.

Writing the lagrangian in momentum space [8], in addition to the usual kinetic terms, interactions with the n.l.r. of the Higgs boson are present, of the form $\overline{\Psi}^i_L P^{ij}_\Sigma \Psi^j_R$. Here P_Σ is a polynomial in Σ^n or $(\Sigma\Sigma^\dagger)^n$ for $SU(5)/SU(4)$ and $SU(5)/SU(4) \times U(1)$ respectively, and the various Ψ are the fermions in which the SM matter is embedded.

In terms of the SM fermions, the lagrangian reads

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{fermion} &= \overline{q}_L \not{p} \left[\Pi^q_0 + \Pi^q_1 g_{q_L}(u_i)\right] q_L + \\ &\quad + \overline{t}_R \not{p} \left[\Pi^u_0 + \Pi^u_1 g_{t_R}(u_i)\right] t_R + \overline{b}_R \not{p} \left[\Pi^d_0 + \Pi^d_1 g_{b_R}(u_i)\right] b_R + \\ &\quad + f \overline{t}_R \left[M^u_1 g_{tq}(u_i)\right] q_L + f \overline{b}_R \left[M^d_1 g_{bq}(u_i)\right] q_L \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where the $\Pi_i(Q^2)$ are form factors controlled by the strong sector and the $g(u_i)$ functions of the Higgs fields. For simplicity, in what follows we will limit ourselves to the lower dimensional representations of $SU(5)$, *i.e.* **5** and **10**, although also higher dimensional representations in principle can be used. In terms of $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ they read

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{5} &= (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2}) + (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) \\ \mathbf{10} &= (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2}) + (\mathbf{3},\mathbf{1}) + (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3})\end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Let us first discuss the case in which both the left (LH) and right (RH) fermions are embedded in the fundamental representation. To accommodate hypercharge, each RH singlet must be embedded in an independent fundamental, with appropriate X-charge. This implies that, to form $U(1)_X$ invariants, q_L must be associated to two independent fundamentals, respectively Ψ^t_L and Ψ^b_L. In a 5D picture, this is achieved decoupling the additional degrees of freedom through a mass term in the brane [9,11]. However, since b_L does not belong to $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2})_{\mathbf{2/3}}$, the Zb_Lb_L vertex is not protected. In models with only one Higgs doublet, this is not necessarily a shortcoming since the breaking is proportional to the relatively small bottom Yukawa coupling [11]. In 2HDM this might become a cause for concern for large $\tan\beta$.

Turning to the case in which both the LH and RH fermions are embedded in a **10**, the RH singlets can now be embedded in a unique $(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3}) \in \mathbf{10}_{2/3}$, with (T_{3L}, T_{3R}) charges given by $u_R = (0,0)$ and $d_R = (0,-1)$. As a consequence, also q_L is embedded in a unique representation and Zb_Lb_L is protected.

The expressions for the g functions, as defined in Eq. (5.1), are collected in Table 1. The expressions are valid for both $SU(5)/SU(4)$ and $SU(5)/SU(4) \times U(1)$, choosing the appropriate

u (see Eqs. (2.4)-(2.6)). This can be understood considering that the relevant interactions with Higgs fields are given in both cases by a projector, and have the same expression in terms of the u coordinates.

In all the previous cases, a 5-dimensional gauge-Higgs unification can be constructed. However, from a purely 4d perspective, the embedding of LH and RH fermions in different representations make sense, so that we will now briefly comment also on this possibility. Since we are confining ourselves only to the $\mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{10}$, only for $SU(5)/SU(4)$ the embedding in different representations is possible. The simplest possibilities are given by:

(a) $(\Psi_L, \Psi_R) \in (\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{10})$, with invariant $\mathbf{5}_\Sigma^T \overline{\mathbf{10}}_R \mathbf{5}_L$. Note that left doublet can be embedded in the $(\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{2})_{\mathbf{2/3}}$, protecting $Zb_L\bar{b}_L$.

(b) $(\Psi_L, \Psi_R) \in (\mathbf{10}, \overline{\mathbf{10}})$, with invariant $\epsilon^{ijkmn}(\mathbf{10}_R)_{ij}(\mathbf{10}_L)_{km}(\mathbf{5}_\Sigma)_n$. Since $b_L = (\mathbf{10}_L)_{54}$ and $b_R = (\overline{\mathbf{10}}_R)_{34/43}$, a mass term $\bar{b}_R b_L$ is forbidden and the bottom mass can only be generated at higher order, explaining in a natural way the bottom/top mass gap. However in both this cases there is no direct couplings between the fermions and the u_5.

(c) $(\Psi_L, \Psi_R) \in (\mathbf{5}, \overline{\mathbf{5}})$, which leads to a phenomenology similar to the $(\mathbf{5}, \mathbf{5})$ case up to a phase in the Yukawa interactions.

Let us comment in detail on how the flavor problem is solved in our case. As pointed out in [12], the problem is twofold: on the one hand, one has to face the usual 2HDM problem of ensuring Minimal Flavor Violation (MFV) in the Yukawa sector. On the other hand, a common feature of composite Higgs models is that in general an invariant Yukawa term is of the form $\overline{\Psi}^i_L P^{ij}_\Sigma \Psi^j_R$ with P^{ij}_Σ defined above Eq. (5.1), and a priori there is no reason to have alignment between the different flavor matrices defining the couplings of different powers of the non-linear Higgs fields [15].

In the cases under consideration, the problem of MFV is solved because the representations considered, *i.e.* $\mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{10}$, are small enough to allow only one embedding, ensuring in this way the absence of Higgs mediated FCNC. Moreover, the relevant part of the interaction is given by the $uu^\dagger$ projector, that allows to factor out the Higgs dependent part and to write a unique Yukawa structure:

$$P^{ij}_\Sigma = \sum_n \alpha_{(n)} a^n_{ij} uu^\dagger = Y_{ij} uu^\dagger \tag{5.3}$$

Since the same property applies also to the Π_1 form factors, we conclude that the two doublets do not induce flavor changing.

6 Scalar Potential

The Higgs fields arise as Goldstone modes, so that at tree level the shift symmetry prevents them to have any potential. However, the global symmetry is explicitly broken once the SM group is gauged and the fermions are coupled to the Higgs system, so that the Goldstone modes get a one loop potential à la Coleman-Weinberg. The potential can be computed with standard techniques, and may be written in general as

$$V = V_{gauge} + V_{fermion}, \tag{6.1}$$

In terms of the u variables, and to lowest order in g^2 and g'^2, the gauge part of the potential for the neutral components reads

$$V_{gauge} = \frac{3}{2}\int \frac{d^2Q}{16\pi^2}\frac{\Pi_1}{\Pi_0}\left(\left(\frac{3g^2+g'^2}{4}\right)\left(|u_2|^2+|u_3|^2\right)+D^A D^A\right) \tag{6.2}$$

with $D^A = g_A u^\dagger T^A u$. This term is the additional contribution arising from the terms quartic in u in the gauge part of the Lagrangian, as given in Eq. (2.8), and closely resembles the supersymmetric case (without $B\mu$ term).

The fermionic contribution $V_{fermion}$ in Eq. (6.1) can be simplified in the reasonable limit in which b_R couples to the strong sector with a relatively small coupling. With this assumption, and to first order in the ratios Π_1^a/Π_0^a, the potential for the neutral components results:

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(\mathbf{10})}_{fermion} &= \int \frac{d^4Q}{16\pi^2}\left(\frac{\Pi_1^{q_L}}{\Pi_0^{q_L}}+\frac{1}{2}\frac{\Pi_1^{t_R}}{\Pi_0^{t_R}}\right)\left(|u_2|^2+|u_3|^2\right)+\left(\frac{\Pi_1^{q_L}}{\Pi_0^{q_L}}-\frac{f^2}{Q^2}\left|\frac{M_1^t}{\sqrt{\Pi_0^{q_3}\Pi_0^{t_R}}}\right|^2\right)|u_3|^2+ \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{2}\frac{\Pi_1^{t_R}}{\Pi_0^{t_R}}\left(|u_2|^2+|u_3|^2\right)^2+\frac{f^2}{Q^2}\left|\frac{M_1^t}{\sqrt{\Pi_0^{q_3}\Pi_0^{t_R}}}\right|^2|u_3|^2\left(|u_2|^2+|u_3|^2\right) \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

for fermions embedded in a **10**, and

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(\mathbf{5})}_{fermion} &= \int \frac{d^4Q}{16\pi^2}\frac{\Pi_1^{q_L}}{\Pi_0^{q_L}}\left(-|u_2|^2-|u_3|^2\right)+\frac{\Pi_1^{t_R}}{\Pi_0^{t_R}}\left(|u_2|^2+|u_3|^2\right) \\ &\quad -\frac{f^2}{Q^2}\left|\frac{M_1^t}{\sqrt{\Pi_0^{q_3}\Pi_0^{t_R}}}\right|^2|u_3|^2\left(1-|u_2|^2-|u_3|^2\right)+\frac{\Pi_1^{t_R}}{\Pi_0^{t_R}}|u_2|^2|u_3|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

for fermions embedded in a **5**, with structure functions defined in Eq. (5.1).

Some comments are now in order:

- In both the considered cases there is a tree level contribution to the T parameter, $\propto (|u_2|^2-|u_3|^2)^2/|u|^2$. Unfortunately, the potential given in Eqs. (6.3)-(6.4) does not align the vev of the two Higgs doublets, leading in general to an anomalous contribution. One can however conjecture that since the coefficients of the terms in the potential are a priori undetermined, the violation of the custodial symmetry breaking may be within the experimental limits in some region of the parameter space. However, in general one would expect that this would put crippling constraint on the parameter $\epsilon \equiv v/f$, making these theories unobservable in the near future.

- In this case the custodial symmetry is essentially broken by the top Yukawa coupling owing to the embedding of q_L (see Appendix C) that explicitly breaks $SU(2)_R$. One can improve the situation introducing custodial fermions in the $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2})$ representation of $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ [19]. These fermions can play a dual role in addressing the issue with the T parameter. On one hand they would soften the custodial symmetry breaking due to the top Yukawa coupling, reducing the tree level contribution through the higher dimensional terms. On the other hand, they can contribute at one loop level to shift T in the correct direction. Interestingly, they might also contribute through loops to increase $Br(h \to \gamma\gamma)$ [20], in agreement with the recent observations at the LHC. They naturally provide an interesting phenomenological set up, detailed study of which is beyond the mandate of this paper.

- The fifth component of u always appears in the potential as $|u_5|^2$. For $SU(5)/SU(4)$, one has $|u_5|^2 = 1 - \sin^2\left(\frac{\varphi}{f}\right)\frac{|\Phi|^2+|\tilde{\Phi}|^2}{\varphi^2}$, so that all the dependence on the 9^{th} GB comes from $\sin\left(\frac{\varphi}{f}\right)/\varphi$. The fact that η only appears as a function of φ implies that there is always a massless particle in the spectrum. Indeed, if we consider the simplified case in which just one u component takes a non vanishing vev, since $V = V(|u|^2)$, at the minimum the mass matrix in the (u, η) basis has the form

$$M^2 = \begin{pmatrix} V'' & V''\frac{\partial|u|^2}{\partial\eta} \\ V''\frac{\partial|u|^2}{\partial\eta} & V''\left(\frac{\partial|u|^2}{\partial\eta}\right)^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

  with $V'' = \partial^2 V/\partial|u|^2$, which has vanishing determinant. The result trivially generalizes to the case in which we consider more u components.

- This problem is independent of the choice of fermion embeddings. In the case $\Sigma = u$, it may be solved introducing two or more right handed neutrinos. Consider $N_R^{1,2}$, two neutrinos that couple to two different strong sector operators, having representations $N_R^{1,2} = 5 + \zeta^{1,2}\bar{5}$. In this case a potential for the singlet field is generated at the leading order by the coupling $N_R^1 \bar{N}_R^2 P_\Sigma + h.c.$. This might lead to interesting phenomenological consequences [1] that are beyond the scope of the present paper.

- Finally, we note that the structure of the potential given in Eqs. (6.1)-(6.2) indicates, in rather general terms, a quite degenerate spectrum for the neutral and charged Higgs fields. This implies a relatively small contribution to T at one loop order, since (H^+, A, H^-) behaves approximately as a custodial symmetry triplet [21].

7 Symmetry breaking $SO(9)/SO(8)$

We turn now to the symmetry breaking pattern $SO(9)/SO(8)$. As anticipated in Eq. (4.5), we expect the tree-level contribution to T to identically vanish. With the generators given in Appendix B, Eq. (4.2) can be written as

---

[1] In particular, the breaking of lepton number by the strong sector should be treated carefully [13]. We thank J. Serra for calling our attention on this point.

$$u = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sin(\varphi/f)}{\varphi}\phi_1 \\ \frac{\sin(\varphi/f)}{\varphi}\phi_2 \\ \cos(\varphi/f) \end{pmatrix} , \tag{7.1}$$

where $\varphi = \sqrt{\phi_1^2 + \phi_2^2}$, and $\phi_{1,2}$ are the two Higgs doublets, each written as a **4** of $SO(4)$. Unlike the cases considered so far, here each doublet ϕ_i is a **4** of a different $SO(4)_i$, with the gauge group embedded in the direct sum $SO(4)_1 \oplus SO(4)_2$.

It is straightforward to check the the kinetic lagrangian (4.5) is equivalent to the CCWZ construction, and that the masses of the gauge bosons are given by

$$\mathcal{L}_m = f^2 \langle u^2 \rangle \frac{g^2}{2} \left(W_\mu^+ W_\mu^- + \frac{1}{2\cos\theta_W} Z_\mu Z_\mu \right) , \tag{7.2}$$

with $\langle u^2 \rangle = \langle u_3^2 \rangle + \langle u_4^2 \rangle + \langle u_7^2 \rangle + \langle u_8^2 \rangle$ the sum over the vevs of the zero charge components, according to the conventions of Appendix B.

As expected, the tree-level contribution to T vanishes independently from the vacuum alignment of the two doublets.

Let us turn now to the fermions. The smaller $SO(9)$ representations decompose under $SU(2)^2 \times SU(2)^2 \subset SO(8)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{9} &= (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) + (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2}) + (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1}) , \\ \mathbf{16} &= (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}) + (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}) + (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2}) + (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1}) . \end{aligned} \tag{7.3}$$

We see that several possibilities exist for the SM fermions embedding. In particular, insisting with $q_L \in (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2}) \in SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ to protect the $Zb\bar{b}$ vertex from large corrections, in all the cases two independent embeddings are possible, each one with a Yukawa structure a priori not aligned with the others. This follows from the requirement that the gauge group is embedded in the sum $SO(4)_1 \oplus SO(4)_2$. The resulting Higgs mediated FCNC can be avoided enforcing alignment in flavor space between the different Yukawa structures.

8 Conclusions

In this paper we have studied some composite Higgs models with extended scalar sectors. A detailed analysis has been carried out for the cosets $SU(5)/SU(4)[\times U(1)]$ and $SO(9)/SO(8)$, which deliver two SM doublets or, for $SU(5)/SU(4)$, two SM doublets and one singlet.

In both the $SU(5)$ cases, despite the presence of a large $SO(4) \subset SU(4)$ custodial symmetry, a contribution to T is present already at tree level. This is also the case for most of the other cosets defining composite Two Higgs Doublet Models (with the exception of $Sp(6)/Sp(4) \times Sp(2)$ in which no such a contribution is present at tree level). These models can be made phenomenologically viable assuming the custodial symmetry to be effective in a region of parameter space or, as proposed in [12], requiring a discrete symmetry to make one of the two doublets inert or almost inert.

On the contrary, in the $SO(9)/SO(8)$ case, the presence of a large $SO(4) \times SO(4)$ custodial symmetry guarantees the absence of tree level contribution to T, independently from the vacuum alignment of the two doublets.

Turning to fermions, we analyzed the embedding of the matter fields in the smallest $SU(5)$ and $SO(9)$ representations, paying attention to the effects on the $Zb\bar{b}$ vertex and on the presence of Higgs-mediated FCNC. In the $SU(5)$ cases, we find that $Zb\bar{b}$ is protected only when the SM fermions are embedded in a **10**, while Higgs mediated FCNC are always absent because the non linear Higgs representation has single couplings to fermions and it acts as a projector. This is no longer true in the $SO(9)$ case, where the quark doublet can be embedded in more than one way also in the smaller representations, each one with its own independent Yukawa structure. Unless alignment is assumed in flavor space, this can cause troublesome Higgs mediated FCNC.

Acknowledgements

We thank J. Serra, M. Redi and A. Wulzer for useful comments. E.B. thanks M. Frigerio and R. Contino for useful discussions. This work has been partially supported by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche under contract ANR 2010 BLANC 041301. The work of TSR is supported by EU ITN, contract "UNILHC" PITN-GA-2009-237920 and the CEA-Eurotalents program. HS is supported by a CAPES Foundation (Ministry of Education of Brazil) Postdoc Fellowship.

Appendices

A Embedding of the Standard Model charges in $SU(5)$

The SM charges, embedded in the first four entries of the 5 × 5 $SU(5)$, are given by

$$T_L^i = 1_{2\times 2} \times \tau^i, \quad T_R^3 = \tau^3 \times 1_{2\times 2} \tag{A.1}$$

with τ^i the usual $SU(2)$ generators. In terms of (T_L^3, T_R^3) charges, this choice corresponds to a $SU(5)$ fundamental decomposed as

$$\mathbf{5} = \begin{pmatrix} (+,+) \\ (-,+) \\ (+,-) \\ (-,-) \\ (0,0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

B Embedding of the Standard Model charges in $SO(9)$

The NGB matrix, as defined in Eq. (4.2), is given by

$$\Pi = \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} \multicolumn{2}{c|}{\multirow{2}{*}{$0_{8\times 8}$}} & \phi_1 \\ & & \phi_2 \\ \hline -\phi_1^T & -\phi_2^T & 0 \end{array}\right), \tag{B.1}$$

with $(\phi_{1,2})_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, 4$ the 8 NGBs in the coset.

The SM charges are embedded in the unbroken $SO(8)$, which contains two orthogonal $SO(4)$ subgroups. They may be embedded in $SO(9)$ as

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc|c} SO(4)_1 & & \\ & SO(4)_2 & \\ \hline & & \end{array}\right) . \tag{B.2}$$

The generators of each $SO(4)_i \simeq SU(2)^i_L \times SU(2)^i_R$ may be written as

$$(t^a_{L,R})_{ij} = -\frac{i}{2}\left[\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{abc}\left(\delta_{bi}\delta_{cj} - \delta_{bj}\delta_{ci}\right) \pm \left(\delta_{ai}\delta_{4j} - \delta_{aj}\delta_{4i}\right)\right] \tag{B.3}$$

In order to have two EW doublets, the SM charges must act on ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 in the same way, so that they must be embedded in the sum $SO(4)_1 \oplus SO(4)_2$. Thus their embedding in the unbroken $SO(8)$ read

$$T^a_{L,R} = \mathrm{diag}(1,1) \otimes t^a_{L,R} \tag{B.4}$$

C Embedding of the Standard Model fermions in $SU(5)$ representations

The $SU(5)$ fundamental decomposes as $\mathbf{5} = (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2}) + (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1})$ under $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$. For $SU(5)/SU(4)$, the two LH quarks must be embedded in different bidoublets:

$$\begin{array}{rl} q^t_L \in (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2})_{\mathbf{2/3}} & \text{with} \quad t_L = (+,-) \\ q^b_L \in (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2})_{\mathbf{-1/3}} & \text{with} \quad b_L = (-,+) \\ u_R \in (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1})_{\mathbf{2/3}} & \\ d_R \in (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1})_{\mathbf{1/3}} & \end{array}$$

where in the last column we specified the (T^3_L, T^3_R) assignment.

The specific embeddings are

$$\Psi_{q_L} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{2\times1} \\ q_L \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_{2/3} \quad \Psi_{q'_L} = \begin{pmatrix} q_L \\ 0_{2\times1} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}_{-1/3} \quad \Psi_{t_R} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{2\times1} \\ 0_{2\times1} \\ t_R \end{pmatrix}_{2/3} \quad \Psi_{b_R} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{2\times1} \\ 0_{2\times1} \\ b_R \end{pmatrix}_{-1/3} \tag{C.1}$$

Turning to the $SU(5)$ symmetric representation, it corresponds to $\mathbf{10} = (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2}) + (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3}) + (\mathbf{3},\mathbf{1})$ under $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$. To accommodate hypercharge, the $U(1)_X$ charge has to be fixed to $X = 2/3$, with assignment

$$\begin{array}{rl} q_L \in (\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2})_{\mathbf{2/3}} & \text{with} \quad t_L = (+,-),\ b_L = (-,+) \\ u_R \in (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3})_{\mathbf{2/3}} & \text{with} \quad t_R = (0,0) \\ d_R \in (\mathbf{1},\mathbf{1})_{\mathbf{1/3}} & \text{with} \quad b_R = (0,-1) \end{array}$$

The explicit embeddings are

$$\Psi_{q_L} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{cc|c} \multicolumn{2}{c|}{0_{4\times4}} & \begin{array}{c} 0_{2\times1} \\ q_L \end{array} \\ \hline 0_{1\times2} & q^T_L & 0 \end{array}\right), \quad \Psi_{t_R} = \frac{t_R}{2}\left(\begin{array}{cc|c} 0_{2\times2} & i\sigma_2 & 0_{2\times1} \\ i\sigma_2 & 0_{2\times2} & 0_{2\times1} \\ \hline 0_{1\times2} & 0_{1\times2} & 0 \end{array}\right), \quad \Psi_{d_R} = \frac{b_R}{\sqrt{2}}\left(\begin{array}{cc|c} 0_{2\times2} & 0_{2\times2} & 0_{2\times1} \\ 0_{2\times2} & i\sigma_2 & 0_{2\times1} \\ \hline 0_{1\times2} & 0_{1\times2} & 0 \end{array}\right). \tag{C.2}$$

D $Sp(6)/Sp(4) \times Sp(2)$

$Sp(n)$ is the group of unitary transformations that leave invariant $\Omega_n \equiv 1_{n/2} \times i\sigma_2$, *i.e.* such that $U\Omega_n U^T = \Omega_n$.

A possible parametrization for the breaking $Sp(6) \to Sp(4) \times Sp(2)$ is given by the vacuum

$$\Sigma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} i\sigma_2 & & \\ & i\sigma_2 & \\ & & -2i\sigma_2 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{D.1}$$

with excitations parametrized as

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma &= e^{\frac{i\Pi^T}{f}} \Sigma_0 e^{\frac{i\Pi}{f}} \\ &= \Omega_6 + 3 \left(u u^\dagger \Omega_6 \right)^T - 3 \left(u u^\dagger \Omega_6 \right) . \end{aligned} \tag{D.2}$$

Here

$$\Pi = \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} \multicolumn{2}{c|}{\multirow{2}{*}{$0_{4\times 4}$}} & \Phi_1 \\ & & \Phi_2 \\ \hline \Phi_1^\dagger & \Phi_2^\dagger & 0_{2\times 2} \end{array} \right) , \quad u = \begin{pmatrix} i \frac{\sin\left(\frac{\varphi}{f}\right)}{\varphi} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\Phi}_1 \\ \hat{\Phi}_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \cos\left(\frac{\varphi}{f}\right) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{D.3}$$

with $\hat{\Phi}_i$ the first column of Φ_i and $\varphi = \sqrt{|\hat{\Phi}_1|^2 + |\hat{\Phi}_2|^2}$. $\vec{u} = \{u_i\},\ i = 1, \dots 4$ transforms as a **4** of $Sp(4)$, and $|\vec{u}|^2 + u_5^2 = 1$.

The kinetic lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = f^2 \left(\partial^\mu u^\dagger \partial_\mu u - \partial^\mu u^\dagger u u^\dagger \partial_\mu u - \partial^\mu u^\dagger \Omega_6 u^\dagger \partial_\mu u \Omega_6 u \right) , \tag{D.4}$$

so that a tree-level contribution to T is expected through the higher dimensional terms.

However, as pointed out in [12], this contribution vanishes identifying $SU(2)_L \equiv Sp(2)$ and $U(1)_Y \subset Sp(4)$.

Let us first of all notice that, unlike the $SU(5)$ or $SO(9)$ breaking studied in this paper, here for both the embeddings the gauge charges T_L^3 and T_R^3 are orthogonal, so that the usual kinetic term $\partial^\mu u^\dagger \partial_\mu u$ does not reproduce the gauge SM lagrangian.

More specifically, when $SU(2)_L \subset Sp(4), U(1)_Y \subset Sp(2)$, the gauge generators are embedded as

$$T_L^a = \mathrm{diag}(1,1,0) \otimes \tau^a, \quad T_R^3 = \mathrm{diag}(0,0,1) \otimes \tau^3 \tag{D.5}$$

Instead, when $SU(2)_L \equiv Sp(2), U(1)_Y \subset Sp(4)$, we embed the gauge generators as

$$T_L^a = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} 0_4 & 0 \\ \hline 0 & \tau^a \end{array} \right) , \quad T_R^3 = \left(\begin{array}{cc|c} \tau^3 & & 0 \\ & \tau^3 & \\ \hline \multicolumn{2}{c|}{0} & 0 \end{array} \right) \tag{D.6}$$

	1	$-uu^\dagger$	$\Omega u^* u^T \Omega$
$SU(2)_L \subset Sp(4)$	$2\|\vec{u}\|^2 W^+ W^-$	0	$-2(u_1^* u_1^* + u_3^* u_3^*)(u_1 u_1 + u_3 u_3) W^+ W^-$
	$W_3^2 \|\vec{u}\|^2 + B^2 u_5^2$	$-\left(W_3 \|\vec{u}\|^2 + B u_5^2\right)^2$	0
$SU(2)_L = Sp(2)$	$2u_5^2 W^+ W^-$	0	$-2u_5^4 W^+ W^-$
	$B^2 \|\vec{u}\|^2 + W_3^2 u_5^2$	$-\left(B \|\vec{u}\|^2 + W_3 u_5^2\right)^2$	0

Table 2: Contributions to the gauge bosons masses for the two possible embeddings of the gauge group.

The contributions to the gauge boson masses coming from the different terms in the kinetic lagrangian are summarized in Table 2 for the two possible embeddings. Considering that $u_5^2 = 1 - |\vec{u}|^2$, we can see that when $SU(2)_L = Sp(2)$ the terms combine in such a way that no contribution to T is generated at tree level.

Turning to the fermions, the smaller $Sp(6)$ representations decompose under $Sp(2) \times Sp(4)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{14} &= (\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{4}) + (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{5}) + (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}) \\ \mathbf{21} &= (\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{4}) + (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{10}) + (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}) \end{aligned} \tag{D.7}$$

Similarly to what happens for $SO(9)/SO(8)$, also in this case there are several ways to embed the SM fermions in a $Sp(6)$ representation, so that unless alignment is assumed in flavor space, Higgs mediated FCNC are expected.

References

[1] **ATLAS Collaboration**, G. Aad et al., *"Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC"*, Phys.Lett. **B716** (2012) 1–29, `arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]`.

[2] **CMS Collaboration**, S. Chatrchyan et al., *"Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC"*, Phys.Lett. **B716** (2012) 30–61, `arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]`.

[3] D. B. Kaplan and H. Georgi, *"SU(2) x U(1) Breaking by Vacuum Misalignment"*, Phys.Lett. **B136** (1984) 183.

[4] H. Georgi, D. B. Kaplan, and P. Galison, *"Calculation of the Composite Higgs Mass"*, Phys.Lett. **B143** (1984) 152.

[5] H. Georgi and D. B. Kaplan, *"Composite Higgs and Custodial SU(2)"*, Phys.Lett. **B145** (1984) 216.

[6] M. J. Dugan, H. Georgi, and D. B. Kaplan, *"Anatomy of a Composite Higgs Model"*, Nucl.Phys. **B254** (1985) 299.

[7] J. M. Maldacena, *"The Large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity"*, Adv.Theor.Math.Phys. **2** (1998) 231–252, `arXiv:hep-th/9711200 [hep-th]`.

[8] K. Agashe, R. Contino, and A. Pomarol, *"The Minimal composite Higgs model"*, Nucl.Phys. **B719** (2005) 165–187, `arXiv:hep-ph/0412089 [hep-ph]`.

[9] R. Contino, L. Da Rold, and A. Pomarol, *"Light custodians in natural composite Higgs models"*, Phys.Rev. **D75** (2007) 055014, `arXiv:hep-ph/0612048 [hep-ph]`.

[10] R. Contino, T. Kramer, M. Son, and R. Sundrum, *"Warped/composite phenomenology simplified"*, JHEP **0705** (2007) 074, `arXiv:hep-ph/0612180 [hep-ph]`.

[11] B. Gripaios, A. Pomarol, F. Riva, and J. Serra, *"Beyond the Minimal Composite Higgs Model"*, JHEP **0904** (2009) 070, `arXiv:0902.1483 [hep-ph]`.

[12] J. Mrazek, A. Pomarol, R. Rattazzi, M. Redi, J. Serra, et al., *"The Other Natural Two Higgs Doublet Model"*, Nucl.Phys. **B853** (2011) 1–48, `arXiv:1105.5403 [hep-ph]`.

[13] M. Frigerio, J. Serra, and A. Varagnolo, *"Composite GUTs: models and expectations at the LHC"*, JHEP **1106** (2011) 029, `arXiv:1103.2997 [hep-ph]`.

[14] K. Agashe, R. Contino, L. Da Rold, and A. Pomarol, *"A Custodial symmetry for Zb anti-b"*, Phys.Lett. **B641** (2006) 62–66, `arXiv:hep-ph/0605341 [hep-ph]`.

[15] K. Agashe and R. Contino, *"Composite Higgs-Mediated FCNC"*, Phys.Rev. **D80** (2009) 075016, `arXiv:0906.1542 [hep-ph]`.

[16] R. Contino, D. Marzocca, D. Pappadopulo, and R. Rattazzi, *"On the effect of resonances in composite Higgs phenomenology"*, JHEP **1110** (2011) 081, `arXiv:1109.1570 [hep-ph]`.

[17] R. Barbieri, B. Bellazzini, V. S. Rychkov, and A. Varagnolo, *"The Higgs boson from an extended symmetry"*, Phys.Rev. **D76** (2007) 115008, `arXiv:0706.0432 [hep-ph]`.

[18] M. Farina, C. Grojean, and E. Salvioni, *"(Dys)Zphilia or a custodial breaking Higgs at the LHC"*, JHEP **1207** (2012) 012, `arXiv:1205.0011 [hep-ph]`.

[19] A. Pomarol and J. Serra, *"Top Quark Compositeness: Feasibility and Implications"*, Phys.Rev. **D78** (2008) 074026, `arXiv:0806.3247 [hep-ph]`.

[20] A. Azatov and J. Galloway, *"Light Custodians and Higgs Physics in Composite Models"*, Phys.Rev. **D85** (2012) 055013, `arXiv:1110.5646 [hep-ph]`.

[21] G. Branco, P. Ferreira, L. Lavoura, M. Rebelo, M. Sher, et al., *"Theory and phenomenology of two-Higgs-doublet models"*, Phys.Rept. **516** (2012) 1–102, `arXiv:1106.0034 [hep-ph]`.